

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 24, 2006 and the subsequent Advisory Action dated November 16, 2006 have been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

The Abstract is amended into proper language and format. Claims 8 and 17-25 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention and claim 16 is cancelled without prejudice. The Applicant is grateful for the indication that claims 17-25 were in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment of claims 17-25, do not alter the scope of the previously allowed claims, and were made in an effort to more clearly define and protect the Applicant's invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments were not made in view of any prior art, and that the claims should continue to be in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added, and no new issues have been raised which require further consideration and/or search. Claims 1-7 having been allowed. Claims 8-15 and 17-25 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action objected to the Abstract because of implied phrases. Applicant respectfully submits that the Abstract is in proper language and format. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is amended to more clearly

recite an apparatus. The rejection of claim 16 is moot in light of the cancellation of this claim. Thus, claims 8-15 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Office Action asserted that these claims overlap two different statutory classes of invention. The rejection of claim 16 is moot in light of the cancellation of this claim. Applicant respectfully submits that as stated above, claim 8 is amended to properly and clearly recite an apparatus and therefore, does not overlap two statutory classes. Claims 9-15 are dependent upon claim 8, and have been amended as appropriate. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

Further, the Advisory Action dated November 16, 2006 stated that the amendment of claims 8 and 17 in the Response that was filed on October 24, 2006 introduced new matter because the specification and drawings did not show two triggering units. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 17, 19 and 23 are amended to recite one triggering unit. Thus, claims 8 and 17 as amended do not include new matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-15 and 17-25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that each of claims 8-15 and 17-25 be allowed in addition to allowed claims 1-7, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jkm

Enclosures: Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal
Check No. 15433